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#### **Turn-Conscription weakens the military as it trades off with specialization and production efficiency.**

**Poutvaara & Wagener 09’** (Panu - Director of the ifo Center for International Institutional Comparisons and Migration Research and Andreas - Professor for Economics, esp. Social Policy, and Director of the Institute of Social Policy, Leibniz University of Hannover (since 2006)), “The Political Economy of Conscription”, CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2821 CATEGORY 2: PUBLIC CHOICE OCTOBER 2009, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1491419>  
**Economists generally hold that a military draft is the inferior way to raise an army**. Adam Smith made a clear case against conscription and found an “irresistible superiority which a well-regulated standing [i.e., all-volunteer] army has over a militia [i.e., temporary conscription]” (Smith 1976, p. 701). Smith’s arguments focus on comparative advantage and the benefits from specialization. **The principle of comparative advantage demands that jobs be assigned to individuals who are relatively more productive than others in doing them. By forcing everybody into a military occupation, irrespective of their relative productivities, military conscription violates that principle and involves an inefficient match between people and jobs. Benefits from specialization arise when individuals, after being employed for a single set of tasks over a longer period, become more productive than those with less experience. Effective warfare or defense operations require a considerable degree of training and mastery** in handling complex weapon systems. **By lack of specialization, drafted short-term soldiers are inferior to long(er)-term professionals. Societies that rely on military conscription thus forego productivity gains. In total, armies tend to be economically more efficient the more they are based on volunteerism and the more permanent they are**. In Figure 2, this is indicated by the diagonal arrow.

#### Plan won’t happen- budget cuts get rid of Nat. service programs

**Green** **17’** Green, Erica L. “Trump’s Budget, Breaking Tradition, Seeks Cuts to Service Programs.” The New York Times, The New York Times, 25 May 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/05/25/us/politics/trump-budget-americorps-peace-corps-service.html?mcubz=0.

WASHINGTON — In his inaugural address, John F. Kennedy exhorted the youth of America to ask what they could do for their country. In his inaugural budget, President **Trump wants** the **gov**ernment largely **out of the national service business.** Mr. **Trump’s budget** proposal **would eliminate the Corporation for National and Community Service, and with it,**[**AmeriCorps**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/a/americorps/index.html?inline=nyt-org)**, Senior Corps** and Vista, one of Kennedy’s first national service programs. He would zero out a popular loan forgiveness program for graduates who choose public service jobs, and he would cut the Peace Corps by 15 percent. **The cuts would extend to other programs that encourage young Americans to teach** in at-risk schools, become police officers or take careers in social work. Mr. Trump’s budget proposal “ends eight decades of presidential leadership on national service,” said AnnMaura Connolly, president of Voices for National Service. “It’s disappointing to see that strong string of bipartisan leadership broken.” The Trump administration has said the proposals are part of the larger effort to balance the nation’s budget, emphasize national security and spend taxpayer dollars on programs that are efficient and effective.

#### Russia proves compulsory service fails

**A Legislative Proposal 12’** : Mandating National Service, May 10, 12

Despite a tradition of national service dating back to the time of the tsars**, Russia serves as the epitome of a failed program**. Although community service options exist on paper, Russia’s national service initiative is effectively a males-only draft into the military. The unpopularity of the war in Chechnya, combined with the inability of conscripts to choose a specialization, has **led to “thousands of young men” illegally avoiding service** (Bigg). One young man stated, “The Russian army, in its current form, isn’t a professional one… That’s why I simply refuse to be another cog in the machine” (Biggs). Frequent raids by the authorities to catch objectors in places frequented by young people only further demoralize that demographic. The **general population’s unwillingness** to 9 participate in national service has resulted in the military looking elsewhere for manpower, with more than 50% of its members having served criminal sentences in prison. **For those who do** **enter** national service in Russia, their two years in the military are **likened** to **time in prison** (Bigg). In 2009, 149 **conscripts** were reported to **have committed suicide**; however, Human Rights Watch suspects this number was inflated to include new recruits killed during hazing (Karmodi). With certain units controlled by members of ethnic groups, outsiders who join these units are **subjected to** “grossly **abusive and humiliating treatment**” (Bigg). Rather than facilitate cohesiveness, the persistence of this phenomenon foments national discord and ethnocentrism. Corruption, especially rampant in the Russian officer corps, results in the inaction of those with the power to curb the abuse of conscripts. Not only do officers turn a blind eye to the brutal hazing of new recruits, but they “often send soldiers to work at construction sites and pocket all the money they earn” (Karmodi). In one unit, a commander threatened to deal with any concerns by “smashing in…the nose” of the Figure 7: Hazing of Russian Conscripts 10 complainer (Karmodi). As the result of its infamous reputation, President Yeltsin visited this unit. Pending his arrival, the unit’s officers “hid everyone who had visible bruises in a cellar for several days, without any food” (Karmodi). With its rampant abuses of power, lack of flexibility in accommodating the needs of its participants and failure to self-correct, the **Russian national service program demonstrates the pitfalls** of a lack of oversight and the effects of allowing injustices to reoccur without consequences.

Turn- Compulsory national service prevents many from maximally contributing to the common good and interferes with their individual development.   
**Friedersdorf 13’** (Conor - Staff writer at The Atlantic, where he focuses on politics and national affairs. He lives in Venice, California, and is the founding editor of The Best of Journalism, a newsletter devoted to exceptional nonfiction), "The Case Against Universal National Service", The Atlantic, 6/26/13, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/06/the-case-against-universal-national-service/277230/>  
 **Lots of people fulfill obligations beyond themselves that aren't "public service" as we generally understand it: helping to support their single mother and younger siblings**; taking care of a sick parent or grandparent; working so a significant other can afford law or medical school; babysitting for a neighbor while she finishes her master's degree on Wednesday nights; helping a talented but disorganized friend complete her application for art school. **Is it proper to compel those people to reallocate their time, so that they're serving "the public" rather than their family, friends or neighbors? Of course, any opt-out clause for people in the circumstances I've described would make national service so easy to avoid that it wouldn't be universal. People "give" in lots of different ways. Why should one of them be elevated and made compulsory?** 4) After college, I pursued a different path than my sister: I took a job as the beat reporter in Rancho Cucamonga, California. **The stories I wrote for a community newspaper were often the only record of important civic happenings in a city of 100,000 people** -- a huge responsibility, especially for a 22-year-old, and one that caused me to happily work extremely long hours for very modest pay. **Given my skills at the time, as well as my notion of the good, there was no place in America where I would've been of greater value to my fellow citizen**s than the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin. **That job also helped me build skills I've made use of ever since in my career**. As a personal matter, **delaying the start of my journalism career would've had a significant negative impact on my life** (perhaps I'd feel differently if my path to magazine journalism was the Harvard-or-Yale-undergrad-to-internship route; it wasn't). **As a matter of principle, I resist the notion that my job had no public service component**. Would "professional reporter" ever count as national service? On what basis would we decide? If some jobs count, then the state must bless some and diminish others. I certainly question whether various jobs advance the public interest in any way, but I don't think my judgment or the polity's should be decisive.

Turn- Conscription does not lead to a more representative military.  
**Poutvaara & Wagener 09’** (Panu - Director of the ifo Center for International Institutional Comparisons and Migration Research and Andreas - Professor for Economics, esp. Social Policy, and Director of the Institute of Social Policy, Leibniz University of Hannover (since 2006)), “The Political Economy of Conscription”, CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2821 CATEGORY 2: PUBLIC CHOICE OCTOBER 2009, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1491419>  
In fact, there is hardly any reason to believe that conscription makes the military (more) representative.12 First, **to have a genuine cross-section of the population**in the army **was never the aim in conscription countries: Even at its peak, conscription covered substantially less than 50 percent of the population; it excluded women, migrants, and often certain religious groups, fathers, or gays**(Leander, 2004). Second, **even within its target group (young males), the military draft is biased**. For the U.S., today blamed for staffing their professional army mainly with underprivileged minorities and lower-class whites, **analysis of Vietnam era veterans indicates that individuals of high socioeconomic status were widely underrepresented among draftees** (Angrist, 1990). In Germany, males with higher educational status are more likely to be called to service than their peers with lower status (Schneider, 2003). In the Philippines, military training is compulsory for male college and university students while conscription for other groups in the population does not exist (WRI 2009). By contrast, 24 out of the 95 countries with a military draft covered in Mulligan and Shleifer (2005) have shorter terms for college students, eleven of them with complete exemption. **Legal and illegal buyout options favor wealthy, urban, and well-educated citizens.**

Turn- Conscription introduces large social costs like economic distortion and deadweight loss due to avoidance activities.  
**Poutvaara & Wagener 09’** (Panu - Director of the ifo Center for International Institutional Comparisons and Migration Research and Andreas - Professor for Economics, esp. Social Policy, and Director of the Institute of Social Policy, Leibniz University of Hannover (since 2006)), “The Political Economy of Conscription”, CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2821 CATEGORY 2: PUBLIC CHOICE OCTOBER 2009, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1491419>  
In terms of the government budget, operating a draft system is generally cheaper than a professional army: Conscripts are only paid some pocket money rather than the market value of their labor service, and fringe benefits such as health plans, family support, old-age provisions etc. are granted to draftees on a much smaller scale than for professional soldiers (if at all).6 However, **accounting costs do not reflect the real opportunity costs of a conscript army**; the use of compulsion in itself suggests that real costs are higher. The social cost of drafting someone to be a soldier is not what the government chooses to pay him but the minimum amount for which he would be willing to join the army voluntarily.**The discrepancy between budgetary and opportunity costs is substantial**. For example, Kerstens and Meyermans (1993) estimate that **the social cost of the**(now abolished) **Belgian draft system amounted to twice its budgetary cost. A military draft**shares with all other taxes the feature that it is not neutral but rather **induces substantial avoidance activities and, thus causes economic distortions and deadweight losses**. For example, **conscription goes along with various ways of “dodging”, inefficient employment, preemptive emigration, pretend schooling, hasty marriages and other reactions**. **Russia’s statutory two-year draft is avoided by more than 90% of the eligible** men, using means such as fake medical certificates, university studies, bribery, or simply avoiding going to drafting stations (Lokshin and Yemtsov, 2008). Maurin and Xenogiani (2007) find that **higher education enrollment of males in France has decreased since conscription was (de facto) abolished**in 1997 for men born in 1979 or later. The study points to the fact that **some** men **may have attended higher education to postpone their military duties,** possibly hoping to completely circumvent service at a later date. **A similar effect is shown**by Card and Lemieux (2001) **for males who were at the risk to be drafted to the U.S. Army during the Vietnam War.**

**Going to war incurs greater personnel costs with an all-volunteer army because the government must pay enough to attract & retain a sufficient number of volunteers that are willing to engage in dangerous combat.**  
**Henderson & Seagren 12’** (David R - Associate Professor Graduate School of Business and Public Policy Naval Postgraduate School & Chad W - Assistant Professor Operations Research Department Naval Postgraduate School) “Would Conscription Reduce Support For War?”, 6/22/12 Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2093559>  
**Consider a nation that is not currently at war. The difference between its military spending when it is engaged in war and** its spending **during peacetime is the**marginal **cost of fighting the war. If a government that employs a**n all-**volunteer military embarks on a war, it must pay wages that are high enough to attract or retain the requisite number**of volunteers. **Thus, the marginal cost includes both personnel costs and added material costs** such as weapons, munitions, fuel, etc. **Imagine the same government with an equally effective**military **force, but** one that **is manned with conscripts. The marginal cost of going to war includes non-personnel costs and only minimal personnel costs, if any. Under conscription, the government does not face market pressure to increase compensation to soldiers, even if it intends to send those soldiers to engage in dangerous combat**. The conscripted military will still require approximately the same amount of weapons and material, and, thus, **the primary difference in the magnitude of the marginal cost of bringing volunteers to war, compared to bringing an equally capable force of conscripts to war, is personnel cost**.

#### Turn- Reviving coerced national service follows in the footsteps in the most tyrannical governments of history. This alignment must be ethically rejected.

Winter **04’** Bill Winter, LP News Editor. 2004. Mothers Against the Draft. “What's wrong with National Service.” <http://www.mothersagainstthedraft.org/content/view/384/142/>

On the other hand, **if the government owns you, then politicians have every right to tell you what to do. If they decide your country needs you to fight a war, tutor poor children, or plant trees, then you have no right to refuse** -- since your labor belongs to them. Not surprisingly, politicians never justify national service in such stark language. That would conflict with their constant rhapsodizing about it. For the purposes of this discussion, we'll define national service broadly: Any government-mandated term of service, whether in the military, or for private or government agencies, or as a requirement to graduate from school. We'll also include quasi-national service: Any federal program that pays individuals to "volunteer" to do good works. No matter how you define it, though, **politicians tend to talk about national service in lofty,** almost religious, **terms.** For example, Senator John McCain (R-AZ) touts national service as a way to solve a "deeper spiritual crisis within our national culture." Former President Bill Clinton says it can "rekindle the spirit of democracy." Other national service cheerleaders are equally effusive. The Potomac Institute said national service would end the "depression of the national spirit." The Left-wing Mother Jones magazine said it would be a great "social and racial equalizer." Right-winger William F. Buckley, Jr. said it is something Americans would "grow to love." All this begs the question: **If service is so glorious**, and has so many benefits, **why must it be mandatory?** American politicians never answer that question. And, given the history of national service, that's not surprising. **The idea that the state has the right to force individuals into "public service" jobs or to serve in the military has always been irresistible to tyrants** and to big-government theoreticians. For example, in 1848, in The Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels called for the "establishment of industrial armies" to perform (mandatory) work to help build a worker's paradise. In the 1940s, Adolf **Hitler touted** pflichterfulling, or "**fulfillment of duty."** For Germans, that meant an obligation to "serve the community." The philosophical rationale behind it was encapsulated in the popular Nazi slogan: "Gemeinnutz vor Eigennutz!" ("The common interest before self!") It's no coincidence that history's most oppressive ideologies have embraced the concept of national service. As the Ayn Rand Institute's Scott McConnell wrote in the New American (June 9, 1997), national service "is the essential collectivist idea." "In Soviet Russia," McConnell wrote, "the requirement was to serve the proletariat; in Nazi Germany, it was service to the Volk [the people]; in various absolutist monarchies, it was service to the king; in some religious regimes, it's service to God." **Whatever the particular rationale, individuals were considered a "public good," to be used as the government directed.**

#### Turn- Americorps manipulates individual service to strengthen centralized government control.

Walters **96’** John Walters, is the president of the New Citizenship Project. January-February 1996, Number 75. Policy Review. “Clinton's AmeriCorps Values: How the President Misunderstands Citizenship.” http://www.policyreview.org/jan96/walt.html

It quickly became apparent that in the AmeriCorps program, government overshadowed its "partners." **More than one-fourth of AmeriCorps volunteers were placed in** federal, state, or local **government agencies** -- where they would reinforce the bureaucratic state, not rebuild the voluntary sector. The program also drew criticism for channeling tax dollars to liberal advocacy groups and questionable activities, such as sex-education training and "self-esteem" enhancement projects. In retrospect, it is not surprising that such activities arose in a government-subsidized program; robust community groups that enjoy genuine grass-roots support do not need to seek federal grants. And the organizations that do seek out government support are generally those with their own in-house bureaucracies, accustomed to receiving federal social-welfare grants and contracts. Finally, despite the president's statement that government could be used to leverage private resources, the General Accounting Office's audit of the first year of AmeriCorps activities found that **only 12 percent of AmeriCorps's funds came from nongovernmental sources**. The program's supposed ability to "leverage" private funds did not exist; if anything, **AmeriCorps compounded the entitlement mentality that it sought to combat.** Why would citizens support organizations that already received federal aid? In fact, public financing of AmeriCorps often led organizations to substitute the "blessing" of a government grant for the hard work of gaining and sustaining local support. AmeriCorps reveals the administration's fundamental misreading of the components of healthy citizenship. The program provides government subsidies for voluntary activity at the federal, state, and local levels. By so doing**, it conflates volunteering** -- which nearly 90 million Americans regularly do -- **with a federal-government jobs program run by a centralized bureaucracy.** It is, in essence, a Great Society-style program trying to pass as a plan to reinvigorate citizenship and heal communities. But its very premise -- using federal resources to promote voluntarism -- contradicts the principle of self-government that lies at the heart of citizenship. **AmeriCorps blurs the line between the problems and needs best addressed by individuals,** voluntary association and localities **and those best addressed by the federal government.** Instead, it seems to suggest that social problems are the responsibility of the central government, and the federal bureaucracy must direct and improve local solutions.

#### Turn- Mandatory service removes millions from the labor pool

**Fazekas** **14’** David Fazekas, June 6, 2014, Yahoo, What if we reinstated the draft? https://www.yahoo.com/news/blogs/what-if-abc-news/what-if-military-service-became-mandatory-194837736.html?ref=gs

Keep in mind, **mandatory service means plucking** the nation’s youth, **18 to 25-year-olds, out of the economy.** That’s **35 million Americans pushing dirt**, instead of pushing buttons on a cash register. “If you took every 18 and 19 year old, **you would have a tremendous decline in parts of the labor force,**” said Henderson. “It would be harder to get people to work at McDonald's, so wages there would go up for the people that do work, and the prices of those items would go up.”

#### It’s Empirically Proven that Civil liberty suits clog courts

Emshwiller 14(John R; senior national correspondent for the Wall Street Journal, "Justice Is Swift as Petty Crimes Clog Courts", www.wsj.com/articles/justice-is-swift-as-petty-crimes-clog-courts-1417404782, Nov. 30, 2014)//ADS

Someone facing jail time “absolutely should be able to get representation,” Mr. Padwa said. In Washington state, the American Civil Liberties Union and others sued the cities of Mount Vernon and Burlington in 2011 for their treatment of indigent misdemeanor defendants. Like many municipalities, the cities contract with private lawyers. The federal judge handling the case said evidence showed individual lawyer caseloads in those towns ran as high as 1,000 annually—more than twice the maximum recommended by the American Bar Association and others. In a declaration filed in the case, Angela Montague, an Afghanistan war veteran and one of the named plaintiffs, said the lawyers she was provided, Richard Sybrandy and Morgan Witt, didn’t respond to her efforts to discuss the various misdemeanor charges against her, including driving under the influence. “It wasn’t until I became a plaintiff in this class-action lawsuit that Mr. Witt finally contacted me,” Ms. Montague said in her declaration. Messrs. Sybrandy and Witt, through their own lawyer, declined to comment. In court filings, they disputed the plaintiffs’ claims about them

#### Turn- Lawsuits clog US courts, turns the aff and stalls economy

Post 11(**Ashely; InsideCounsel as managing editor ,"Frivolous lawsuits clogging U.S. courts, stalling economic growth", www.insidecounsel.com/2011/07/22/frivolous-lawsuits-clogging-us-courts-stalling-eco?page=1-5, July 22, 2011)//ADS**

Americans’ litigiousness and thirst for massive damages has been a boon to the legal profession. But some researchers and litigation experts warn that the abundance of lawsuits—many of them frivolous—flooding U.S. courts is severely weakening the economy. According to consulting firm Towers Watson, the direct cost of the U.S. tort system in 2009 was approximately $250 billion, which was roughly 2 percent of the gross domestic product. The amount is double the estimated tort expenses in other countries, including the U.K. and Japan. In May, the House Judiciary Committee held a hearing that explored excessive litigation’s effect on the United States’ global competitiveness. During his testimony, Skadden Partner John Beisner explained that plaintiffs counsel engage in five types of litigation abuse that ultimately undermine economic growth: improperly recruiting plaintiffs, importing foreign claims, filing suits that piggyback off government investigations and actions, pursuing aggregate litigation and seeking third-party litigation financing. “America’s litigious nature has caused serious damage to our country’s productivity and innovation. … The root cause is that we have created incentives to sue—and to invest in litigation—instead of establishing disincentives for invoking judicial process unless absolutely necessary. Other countries discourage litigation; we nuture it,” Beisner said at the hearing. Many litigation experts resoundingly agree with Beisner’s stance on the necessity of tort reform to ameliorate the country’s economy. “The entrepreneurial system that we’ve developed for litigation in this country has always been an impetus to bringing cases that are close to the line or even over the line,” says Dechert Partner Sean Wajert. “When you have that kind of encouragement, you have a slippery slope, which sometimes people will slide down and get into questionable and even abusive and frivolous claims along the way.” The result is clogged courts and corporate funds that finance defense costs instead of economic investment. Small businesses and startups with less than $20 million in revenue suffer the most because they pay a higher percentage of their revenues toward tort costs than larger companies do, and therefore they become less able to invest in research and development, create new jobs, and give raises and benefits to employees. One proposed solution to frivolous litigation is the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act (LARA), introduced in March in the House as H.R. 966 and Senate as S. 533 by House Judiciary Committee Chairman Lamar Smith, R-Tex., and Senate Judiciary Committee Ranking Member Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, respectively. The bill would revise and strengthen portions of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which provides for sanctions against parties that file unwarranted or harassing claims. Proponents say LARA would increase plaintiffs’ accountability for meritless lawsuits and deter future frivolous claims. However, the bill faces some opposition and obstacles to becoming law. In 1993, lawmakers made three major changes to Rule 11 in an attempt to reduce the number of motions for sanctions and more quickly conclude federal cases. But critics say the revisions significantly weakened Rule 11 and enabled litigation abuse. LARA essentially would undo the 1993 revisions, which are still in effect today. First, Rule 11 allows judges to use their discretion in imposing sanctions for meritless suits rather than making such sanctions mandatory. Many critics disagree with this optional penalty. “If the case doesn’t meet certain standards and shouldn’t have been filed in the first place, then there ought to be consequences,” Beisner says. Second, Rule 11 grants plaintiffs a 21-day “safe harbor” period to withdraw a claim without incurring any penalties when defendants notify them that they’ll be seeking a motion for sanctions. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia said the change would allow parties to file “thoughtless, reckless, and harassing pleadings, secure in the knowledge that they have nothing to lose: If objection is raised, they can retreat without penalty.” “The problem [with the safe harbor] is that it just allows certain plaintiffs attorneys to go on a ‘fishing expedition’ and dare you to file a motion for sanctions,” Wajert says. Finally, because the rule is supposed to act as a deterrent for meritless claims, the court collects sanctions as monetary penalties instead of directing the money to defendants as compensation. Without reimbursement for court costs and legal fees, pursuing sanctions is often too costly for small businesses. “The defendant has to spend time and money to hire a lawyer to research and draft the motion for sanctions and present it to the other side, so there is a cost involved even if the plaintiffs end up withdrawing the action,” Wajert says. To boost liability for parties that file questionable suits, LARA would make sanctions mandatory for any claims that judges recognize as frivolous. LARA also would eliminate the 21-day safe harbor and award some of the sanction money to defendants. Critics have four main arguments against LARA. Some members of the law community say LARA doesn’t provide broad enough reform because it doesn’t emphasize lawyers’ prelitigation duties. “We might want to look at more accountability for failing to perform due diligence before a lawsuit is filed and for continuing to prosecute a lawsuit after learning the claims that are being asserted are invalid,” Beisner says. Other LARA challengers claim the bill takes tort reform too far and “swats a fly with a hammer,” Wajert says. He notes that some opponents argue there’s not enough empirical evidence to suggest that litigation abuse is a serious problem; however, because frivolous suits often are quickly settled so as to avoid litigation expenses, it is difficult to collect meaningful statistics. “The same applies to the safe harbor,” Wajert notes. “If something is withdrawn and it never gets to the judge’s attention, and therefore never gets into a published opinion, how are we supposed to collect data on that?” Critics also worry that LARA will lead to satellite litigation—or small trials within big trials—challenging sanctions issued by the courts. LARA supporters say that although there will likely be some additional litigation when the Act first becomes effective, suits will slow up once courts clarify how they are interpreting LARA. A final contention against LARA is that it will deter valid lawsuits. But the Act’s proponents say litigants shouldn’t be afraid that judges will liberally issue sanctions. “The Act isn’t going to change the definition of a frivolous claim,” Wajert explains. “Judges are going to be careful to make sure that when they find frivolous, it really is frivolous. It’s unlikely that LARA will impact those that are arguing for a good-faith extension, modification or reversal of existing law.” Victor Schwartz, a partner at Shook, Hardy & Bacon who testified at a congressional hearing about LARA in March, agrees. “LARA is not cutting off peoples’ rights to sue if they have a legitimate claim,” he says. Schwartz says LARA stands a good chance of becoming law if it gets adequate support from Congress and the president. A key factor in LARA’s advance is democratic support, which could be difficult because trial lawyers, who don’t support the bill, are some of the top funders of the Democratic Party. Additionally, the Senate has a democratic majority. Schwartz estimates that LARA would need the support of at least seven Democratic senators to pass. Even if the bill were to reach the president’s desk, Schwartz says it probably wouldn’t pass speedily. Another fairly recent tort reform bill, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, took about eight years to become law, and Schwartz says that he has personally only been involved in four bills over 25 years that were signed by the president. Nonetheless, Schwartz and other LARA supporters remain optimistic that LARA will succeed. “In the [Jan. 25] State of the Union address, the president said he agreed with the Republicans about [the need to reduce costs associated with] frivolous claims. He never endorsed LARA, but he did mention it in what was a very limited menu of topics. It would be unlikely that he would veto the bill,” Schwartz says.

#### Service reduces the amount of people in the workforce; increasing the price of labor.

#### Robinson 04’Braden Robinson, [Has a JD from University of Michigan Law School and a BS/BSME from Grove City College in Mechanical Engineering, Math, and Econ], 10-01-2004, “An Analysis of Conscription”, <http://www2.gcc.edu/dept/econ/ASSC/Papers2004/Conscription_Robinson.pdf>

While the natural rights argument may be sufficient grounds on its own to oppose conscription, it will hardly convince those who only advocate utilitarian approach to ethics. For them, we must show that conscription itself has actual negative side effects. Which would be sufficient on their own to stop the practice. For conscription these effects are obvious. The use of **conscription forces society to undergo a variety of negative economic** and cultural **changes**, not only during the time of conscription but after the war has long ended. **When a country conscripts** soldiers **it artificially reduces the workforce in society. This artificial** reduction in the supply of labor increases the price of labor **and** in turn **reduces the quantity demanded,** **thus reducing the overall number of goods and services a society produces**. Since these parties do not stop consuming goods, food and supplies are still shipped to them overseas, **this** **causes a lower standard of living** than a society would normally experience.5 For a nation using temporary conscription this means that the limited number of goods not allocated for government use during a crisis will be reduced. However, in nations that have **continual conscription** (such as Spain or South Korea), this **acts as a forced emigration,** intentionally reducing the supply of labor in impoverished countries to artificially increase the price of labor. While this does not improve the overall welfare of society, it does allow the government to keep wage levels constant even while the demand of labor falls without causing mass unemployment.7

#### Turn- Compulsory service causes millions to be incarcerated—non-compliers are criminalized

**Nelson** **16’** Nelson, Steve. Gender-Neutral Draft Registration Would Create Millions of Female Felons. US News , Mar. 2016, [www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-05-03/gender-neutral-draft-registration-would-create-millions-of-female-felons](http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-05-03/gender-neutral-draft-registration-would-create-millions-of-female-felons).

A key congressional committee voted last week to require young women to register for potentially compulsory military service, but the **gender-equalizing reform threatens to make felons out of women who refused to participate.** Though prosecutions currently appear unlikely, **men jailed for not registering with the Selective Service System** and some former **authorities** who participated in the cases **are concerned about criminalizing a large swath of the population.** Enforcement wasn’t always lax, and [the law](https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/50/3811) that may be applied to women allows for five-year prison sentences for "knowing and willful" non-registration with an equally long statute of limitations. “**It will inevitably lead to massive resistance**, whether visible in the streets or women just blowing it off the way men have," says Edward Hasbrouck, prosecuted for not registering in the 1980s. "Congress is smoking crack if they think women can be forced to register." Hasbrouck served more than four months in prison after catching the eye of an ambitious federal prosecutor, Robert Mueller, who went on to be FBI director. He originally received a suspended sentence, but recalls an unamused judge sending him to prison in late 1984 for doing peace activism to satisfy court-ordered community service. Hasbrouck considers himself an areligious anarcho-pacifist, but his explanation for refusing to register could come from a run-of-the-mill libertarian: “I had no intention of enslaving myself to the government.”

#### Turn- Prosecution for non-compliance marginalize minorities and create poverty

**Bill Galvin and Maria Santelli** **16’**, Galvin, Bill and Santelli, Maria (Center on Conscience and War), "It Is Time to Abolish Draft Registration and Restore Full Rights to People of Conscience." World Beyond War, 24 Feb. 2016, <http://worldbeyondwar.org/it-is-time-to-abolish-draft-registration-and-restore-full-rights-to-people-of-conscience/>

The **extrajudicial penalties** imposed upon those who choose not to or fail to register **make life more difficult for many who already are marginalized**, **and they** particularly **target conscientious objectors who believe** that registering with **Selective Service is a form of participating in war.** There is no opportunity to register as a conscientious objector. Legal protection for conscientious objectors was provided in the constitutions of several of the original colonies, and was written into early drafts of what became the First and Second Amendments to the Bill of Rights of the US Constitution. **Instead of honoring and upholding these freedoms and protections,** modern **lawmakers** have subjected non-registrants to laws that **deny education, employment and other fundamental opportunities**. **These laws** amount to an unacceptable burden on those individuals who cannot, in good conscience, register, and **in fact serve to punish and marginalize those who are living their lives true to the very essence of our democracy.** The penalties for failure to register are potentially quite severe: it is a federal felony carrying a penalty of up to **5 years in prison** **and a fine of up to $250,000.**Since 1980 millions of young men have violated the law by failing to register. And of those who did register, millions more violated the law by failing to register during the time period prescribed in the law.  Since 1980 a grand total of just 20 people have been prosecuted for failure to register. (The last indictment was on January 23rd, 1986.) Almost all of those prosecuted were conscientious objectors who publicly asserted their non-registration as a religious, conscientious or political statement.

#### Compulsory Service creates psychological harm

**War Resisters' International 98’** Psychosocial Effects of Compulsory Military Service | War Resisters' International. War Resisters' International, 1 Nov. 1998, www.wri-irg.org/en/archive/tri1998/en/wk-pems.htm.

Ten people attended this workshop, which analysed and reflected upon the effects of obligatory military service on both the individual and on the society in which they live. One of the main issues to be highlighted was the role that military instruction has in either reaffirming or building upon forms of social indoctrination already started by other institutions. **Military training imposes conditions on the articulation and organisation of the "psychological system" of the individual.** It **turns the individual into an object**, conditions towards **mechanical learning**, into **accepting without arguing**, and emphasises standard rather than multiple responses. This is all added to a mix which includes discipline, denial of the individual, ritualisation and other **actions designed to encourage submission to power.** We also described the kind of clinical and pathological effects of this kind of education and training. From the discussion that followed, **it** was **evident** that awareness of **the military's role is a function of an individual's personal historical experience**, in **particular the relationship between civilians and "their" military.** Some people from the ex-Yugoslav countries had a different perspective -- not expressed openly but otherwise evident -- which understated the characteristics and consequences of military training. This is probably because of the recent experience of war: their armies are frequently conceived of as as an ally which defends them from external aggressions. It seems basic to stress the need for serious and deep study of the characteristics of armed institutions (training, norms, adherence to ideological doctrines, etc.). Themes such as "Peace Armies", "Actions for Continental Integration", "Consolidation of Military-Civil Relationships", etc. have recently been introduced into the public debate in many countries. This often makes it difficult for us to reframe the debate around the more fundamental question of why armies exist in the first place.

#### Turn- Making national service mandatory belittles authentic volunteerism

Spalding 10’, Matthew. “Compulsory National Service Would Undermine the American Character.” U.S. News & World Report, U.S. News & World Report, 19 Oct. 2010, [www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/10/19/compulsory-national-service-would-undermine-the-american-character](http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/10/19/compulsory-national-service-would-undermine-the-american-character).WBAC

The traditional associations of civil society—families, schools, churches, and voluntary organizations—sustain social order and public morality, moderate individualism and materialism, and cultivate personal character. The concept of national service is altogether different. Government programs, like AmeriCorps, do not encourage sacrificial giving of time and resources, which has the character-forming effect of teaching compassionate responsibility. Instead, they suggest that "volunteerism" could just as well mean a paid job with benefits—or worse, a mandatory obligation. Such government-directed "volunteerism," by encouraging individuals and associations to look to the state as the provider of assistance, belittles authentic volunteerism, the process by which individuals choose without economic benefit to help their neighbor. It also threatens the independence of the private associations that have always been the engine of moral and social reform in America.

#### Mandatory service destroys the community spirit necessary to solve.

The Gazette 02’[“You will volunteer/ National-service schemes ultimately are a self- contradiction,” Feb 7, <http://peacecorpsonline.org/messages/messages/2629/7256.html>] WBAC

It is important to understand that mandatory service is the obverse of - and will undermine - the genuine community that develops from true volunteerism. Voluntary service arises from impulses and moral beliefs within a citizen and is exercised in the way a citizen chooses, which is especially important in a country as large and diverse as ours. That community spirit has already been undermined by government social programs - though the response to the terrorist attacks shows it certainly hasn't died out - and would be further subverted by a program that forced people to do service as the state defines service.

#### Compulsory national service will lead to widespread protests, pushing us over the brink of political instability b/c compulsory means EVERYONE. Backlash is self maintaining at such a scale.

Carey 06’ The Dynamic Relationship Between Protest and Repression, Sabine C. Carey, University of Nottingham, Sabine C. Carey is a German political scientist. Sabine C. Carey is currently Chair in Political Science IV at Universität Mannheim in Germany, First Published March 1, 2006

**When faced with government** sanctions or **coercion, dissidents** are expected to **respond with resistance**. Analyzing the Iranian Revolution, Rasler (1996) argues that due to micromobilization processes protest increases in the long-run when faced with government sanctions. Micromobilization occurs because overt dissident behavior shows the willingness and commitment of others, it makes the goal of their activities desirable, and raises the social rewards for participating in the dissent movement (Chong 1991; Opp 1994; Opp and Roehl 1990).5 Opp and Roehl argue “repression sets in motion ‘micromobilization processes’ that raise the rewards and diminish the costs of participation” (1990: 523).

**Carey continues:**

**Protest movements** tend to **maintain itself** as well. The threshold model suggests that **once a certain,** usually unspecified, **threshold of** number of **participants is crossed**, the **costs of mobilizing a** larger **crowd** decline. Once dissidents have successfully invested in organizing **and** carrying out dissent, the costs of **maintaining momentum** and sustaining protest **decline.** Similarly, the bandwagon model suggests that once a critical mass of protesters is achieved, **[And] more** people **are likely to join because they feel encouraged** by the protesters’ commitment and willingness **to dissent** (e.g., Muller and Opp 1986; Rasler 1996). Therefore, I expect that protest at time t–1 is followed by protest at time t. Various arguments made above, including the bandwagon model, the threshold model, and micromobilization processes, suggest that both protest and repression constantly increase. So why do we generally not expect to see them spiralling out of control? Escalation of repression is hindered by the costs and dangers of widespread and largescale repression. As mentioned before, **severe coercion carries domestic and international costs**. It requires a wellequipped, loyal, and very large repressive apparatus, which is difficult and expensive to maintain. Indiscriminate **[and] continuous repression** is likely to **trigger[s]** a **backlash** and to increase resistance from the opposition (Francisco 1995). International costs include being subject to blaming and shaming by other countries and international organizations, as well as isolation and exclusion from international bodies and in extreme cases the termination of trade relations.6

## Civic Republicanism

#### Civic republicans have to deny the inevitable essentialism they incorporate, and pride of the idea of virtues

Gey 93’ Gey**,** Steven G. “The Unfortunate Revival of Civic Republicanism .” UPenn Law, UPenn, 1993, scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3645&context=penn\_law\_review

The odd thing about civic republican theory is that despite the essentialist (or, to use Sunstein's term, "universalist") nature of civic virtue, the civic republican dialogue is seldom cast as a quest for the"essence" of civic virtue. Rather, the stated intention of civic republican theory is to draw citizens into a joint effort to define their core values. Immediately after referring to the civic republican belief in universalism, Sunstein defines his version of universal-ism as "posit[ing] the existence of a common good, to be found at the conclusion of a well-functioning deliberative process."24 Sunstein, like most modern civic republicans, tries to hedge his bets by moving in two directions at once. Civic virtue definitely exists, but its existence can be confirmed only by the process of collective definition. The problem here is that civic republicans must deny the allegation of essentialism if they are to preserve their main objective of encouraging popular self-rule, defined as "selecting the values that ought to control public and private life."25 This is so because if the essence of civic virtue exists apart from the process of collective deliberation, self-rule becomes an expendable value. If civic virtue has an objective essence, a benign dictator who is well- attuned to civic virtue legitimately could dispense with the ineffi- cient system of republican deliberation and proceed directly to the deliberation's inevitable conclusion. If civic virtue is not an objective value, however, civic republicanism seems to fall right back into the clutches of pluralist theory. If there is no objective meaning to civic virtue, then civic virtue can mean anything a given political system wants it to mean. Without some objective measure by which to judge the outcome of the deliberative process, any collective political system could justify itself as "republican" simply by referring to its conclusions as virtuous. Civic republicans attempt to escape this logical cul-de-sac by ascribing to certain kinds of collective action an almost mystical significance. The argument seems to be that civic virtue exists only as a result of certain kinds of collective action. If a self-governing body of citizens carries out solemn deliberations in a particular way, and conducts its deliberations with a certain selfless mindset, then the product of those deliberations will be, by definition, "civic virtue." The precise nature of this collective deliberation-cum- sanctification is the subject of the next subsection. Civic republicanism is by nature a collectivist political theory. In other words, civic republicanism gives primary empirical and ethical significance to collective, rather than individual human endeavors. Civic republicans view collective endeavors as empirical- ly more significant because the actions of a collective entity such as the government define the way individuals think and behave.

### Police

1. The Plan literally justifies using police force as a form of check, which not only justifies police brutality as a form of a check but also inflates the number of people we have to incorporate payments through our tax money. We already have too many cops on the streets we don’t need to add more, this just perpetuates a system in which we allow people to violate others right because they have the “authority”.
2. More people in the militia is also inherently bad due to the increase in number and with the previous trans ban these people aren’t legally allowed to even if this supposed right was a check on the government. The along with other marginalized groups cant gain access to the authoritarian figures presented in the aff which creates exclusionary policies that entrench oppression in the work force.
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## Women

#### More women into the military will strengthen the military’s culture of masculinity – allow men to use sexual assault to reassert control.

**Burke 98’** Burke, Colleen. Women and Militarism. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1998.

A very contested area of debate about women and militarism is the role of women in the military. While feminists seeking equality with men are opposed to any occupational field being closed to them on the basis of their sex, the goal of having more women in the military is not without its problems. Greater participation in the military as an appropriate means achieving women's liberation must be questioned. To see it as such reinforces its centrality and to integrate women into **the military only increases the militarization of society.** The military itself uses the argument of promoting women's equality in its recruitment information; however, **an institution built on masculine ideals** such as aggression **can hardly** be expected to **play a sincere part in women's emancipation.** If in joining the military **women are** also **turned into unquestioning killing machines**, then what progress or liberation exists in that? What kind of society are they defending? Despite the military's promises of equality and challenging non-traditional careers, women who join are concentrated in clerical and other service jobs which reflect the job ghettos of civilian women. The United States army proudly proclaims that only 28 of 348 occupational specialties are closed to women, however, these positions comprise 42% of all army jobs and are often prerequisites for advancement. **Military women face levels of sexual harassment and rape which are much higher than in civilian life.** The 1991 Tailhook scandal in the United States, where scores of women were assaulted by naval aviators at a convention, was the catalyst for the investigation of the widespread **sexual harassment** throughout the military which **is tolerated and covered-up.** Although women in the military are challenging gender roles by becoming soldiers, they are still judged by them. Military **women are labelled** either **lesbians or prostitutes** and are sexually harassed and **slandered by** their **male colleagues.** Although most militaries routinely purge homosexuals and lesbians from their ranks, women are much more likely to be targeted and discharged for this reason. This widespread sexual harassment (which affects women in armed forces all over the world) bolsters male egos which have been threatened by female competition and invasion of their previously male-only domain. The exclusion of women from combat (which must constantly be redefined in an era of nuclear and high tech combat) is essential to preserving the masculine identity of the military and to justifying the continued male dominant position in the social order. With some countries abandoning compulsory military service for men, and fewer men joining, the armed forces in many countries are currently recruiting women. However, they are quite clearly doing this on their own terms. The "Rosie the Rivetters" of the Second World War who took industrial work while the men were fighting were quickly sent back to their low-paid pre-war roles when the "boys" returned. Women seeking equality must do it on their own terms according to their own goals. Enlisting in the military may mean equality on paper (although even this is debatable), but it does not mean liberation--from restrictive gender roles, from sexual harassment and abuse, or from a society which condones violence. Some argue that a large influx of women into the military will fundamentally change its character as it will cease to be an all-male preserve and women will have more of a stake in the formulation of national security policy. This is a debatable. It seems that **women will be less likely to change the military** and more likely to be changed by it, as the presence of women in the military in several industrialized countries has not yet made a significant impact on the institution.
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